REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **9 August 2007** the Examiner reviewed claims 35-55. Claims 35-39, 41-49, and 51-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Jones (USPN 5,694,984 hereinafter "Jones"). Claims 35, 36, 38, 39, 41-49, and 51-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Rothrock (USPN 5,408,470 hereinafter "Rothrock"). Claims 35, 36, 38, 39, 41-49, and 51-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Zhu (USPN 6,792,436 hereinafter "Zhu"). Claims 40 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Jones. Claims 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rothrock and Zhu. Claims 40 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rothrock, and Zhu.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Examiner rejected claims 35-39, 41-49 and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) for being anticipated by Jones. Applicant respectfully disagrees, because the systems presented by Jones, Rothrock, and Zhu fail to teach a direct update of object change information of distributed data to remote systems by employing a database language to efficiently describe the object changes.

Specifically, embodiments of the present invention provide a system that **utilizes a database language** (i.e., Structured Query Language, SQL) to communicate the object changes to the central database. (See page 7, lines 17-19) Also, embodiments of the present invention provide a system where the **object changes** are **transferred directly**, after every successful commit of the object changes on the central database, from the modifying system to the remote systems that are interested in receiving this object change information. See page 2, lines 23-27, page 7, lines 20-28, and Figure 3, step 308 of the instant application.

In contrast, Jones, Rothrock, and Zhu disclose systems that **do not translate** the object changes into a **database language** before transmitting the changes to a central database or to other remote systems. Instead these, systems **transmit the changed objects themselves**. The Jones system concerns itself with the transmission of objects (Jones, Col. 9, lines 53-55). The Rothrock system concerns itself with the transmission of binary (BLOB) data (Rothrock, col. 13, lines 52-64, col. 21, lines 6-9). The Zhu system concerns itself with the transmission of full object states from the cache (Zhu, Col. 6, line 12-13).

Also, the Jones system teaches away from the present invention by requiring a **centralized entity** to **relay the change/synchronization notices** to other interested objects in other systems. The Jones system utilizes the ObjectMan unit (i.e., a centralized entity) to relay the change/synchronization notices (Jones, col 10, lines 20-22). The Rothrock system also teaches away from the present invention by failing to provide a **direct update** of the object changes from the modifying system to one or more remote systems when the object is not blocked in the database. In this situation, changes are successfully applied onto an object, but the object changes remain local to the modifying system until some later time when a remote system requests for an update of the blocked object. (Rothrock, col 11, lines 59-68, and Figure 6, steps 604-607 and step 620)

The Jones, Rothrock, and Zhu systems are different from the present invention. These systems fail to provide the **object changes** to a remote database or other remote systems **as a database language** (i.e., SQL). Furthermore, the Jones and Rothrock systems fail to forward the object changes **directly between distributed systems** after an object is modified and its changes successfully committed onto the database**,** for an efficient update of shared distributed data.

Therefore Jones, Rothrock, and Zhu fail to teach an efficient and direct update of object changes in distributed data to remote systems by employing a database language to efficiently describe the object changes.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 35, 46, and 55 to clarify the storing, computing, translating, sending, and permanently committing of object changes in a distributed system with shared object information. In particular, these amendments clarify that the present invention efficiently describes the object changes by translating them into a database language. These amendments further clarify that successful object changes are directly communicated between distributed systems by only transmitting the object changes. These amendments find support in lines 23-27 of page 2, line 6 of page 7 through line 7 of page 8, and FIG. 3 of the instant application. No new matter has been added. Applicant has amended claim 35 at line 22, and similarly in claims 46 and 55, to clarify that the objects are included in a remote database system, and not the local cache. This amendment finds support in page 4, lines 13-22.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 35, 46, and 55 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 36-45, which depend upon claim 35, and claims 47-54, which depend upon claim 46, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Gilbert Wong/
Gilbert Wong
Registration No. 57,990

Date: 8 October 2007

Gilbert Wong
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 204-4040
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: gilbert@parklegal.com